DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 055 030 SP 005 254

AUTHOR Geisinger, Robert W.

TITLE Interaction Analysis of Value-Clarification Behaviors.

INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg. Bureau of Educational Research.

PUB DATE Oct 70

NOTE 8p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29

DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Observation Techniques; *Interaction Process Analysis; Student Behavior; Teacher Behavior; *Values; *Verbal Communication

ABSTRACT

To help children use valuing processes, a teacher uses strategies of value clarification. The Flanders' Interaction Analysis Behaviors can be used as a model to construct an instrument for use with value-clarifying responses by teachers. The instrument entitled, "Interaction Analysis of Value-Clarification Behvaiors" (IAVCB) is constructed on this model. As with the Flanders' instrument, all categories are mutually exclusive, yet they include all value talk in the classroom. Teacher Direct Talk includes the categories of 1) lecturing, 2) rebuking or punishing, and 3) dissonant response. Indirect Talk comprises 1) choosing, 2) prizing, 3) acting, and 4) asking questions. Student Talk is classified as 1) response, 2) value indicator, and 3) inquiry. The eleventh category covers silence or confusion. Data are recorded with the IAVCB in the same manner as with the Flanders' instrument. An interaction matrix is then formed using 11 columns, rather than 10, and analyzed in terms of percentages of Teacher Talk and Student Talk. Indirect/Direct ratios can also be computed. (RT)

sol.

SEF 5 1971

ED055030

INTERACTION ANALYSIS OF VALUE-CLARIFICATION BEHAVIORS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Division of Applied Research
Bureau of Educational Research
Pennsylvania Department of Education

A report prepared by

Robert W. Geisinger
Educational Research Assistant

October 1970

SP005254

Learning is largely controlled by one's value hierarchy. An individual acts in accord with his internalized values and a principal bar to learning may lie in a conflict of values (Lippincott, 1969).

Teachers can unwittingly create conflicts of values and value disturbances with children by telling students what to believe and what to value, rather than helping them to work them out by themselves. The basic failure of the schools is that children are forced to settle for their lower Freudian nature because they have no other alternative. Values are Introjected (a Freudian mechanism) by students as a result of the exercise of authority that is part of any educational institution rather than working them out by valuing processes (Pilder, 1968).

This unthinking use of authority can create hostility, resentment and antagonism against schools and school personnel, or it can create a variety of behavior problems that can be usefully seen as resulting from value disturbances. Indeed, perceptions of values can be understood as being distributed along a behavioral continuum. People that are clear in their values lie at one end of the continuum. They are adjusted, mature, positive and purposeful, but others lie at the other end of the continuum. They are uncertain, apathetic, flighty, inconsistent and immature (Raths and others, 1966). When children develop values which differ drastically from the mainstream of American life, one is apt to find apathy toward school; a flighty child who is dissatisfied with his own self-concept (Paschal, 1968).

These kinds of problems can be created through unprofessional use by teachers of direct influences upon the values and beliefs that are held by students. While it may seem natural to a teacher to express his own opinions, goals, purposes, aspirations, attitudes, interests, feelings, beliefs, activities, worries or problems, this is excessive subjective involvement and interference in the right of the student to learn his own values. So a teacher should exert less direct influence upon value learnings of his students.

Children need help in working out their own values. So great are the complexities and confusions that prevail in contemporary life, it is not surprising if even adults are confused about their values.

Values are those elements with which a person decides to use his life. Each person must wrest his own from the available alternatives (Raths and others, 1966). Greater emphasis is needed upon the processes with which these values are selected. Asking questions and learning to ask questions, particularly on values, must be a child's privilege. Educators must talk realistically with children about their beliefs, purposes, attitudes, interests, aspirations, feelings, activities and ways of thinking (Paschal, 1968).

All these matters need clarified because it is the acquisition of values that makes a self. A child grows with growth in self-awareness. Humans can achieve maturity by essential processes of choosing, prizing and acting. To help teachers to contribute to development in selfhood, in values, Raths and others (1966) provided a theory of valuing processes, methodologies for clarification of values and practical ways to use them in the classroom.

Children grow by engaging in the processes of valuing; choosing, prizing and acting. A child can choose freely, choose from alternatives, and choose after consideration. He can prize values in the senses of cherishing and affirming them. He can act in regard to values by doing something, e.g., by asking questions, and by doing it repeatedly (Raths and others, 1966).

A child is ready to grow in matters of values when he utters orally a value indicator. This is an expression by the child about his goals, aspirations, attitudes, interests, feelings, beliefs, activities, worries, problems, or obstacles. A child says something of the general form of, I'm for, I'm against, think, believe, prefer, like, if you ask me, my choice is, etc. Statements like these are classed as value indicators. They indicate to the observant teacher that a child is ready for valuing processes.

To help children to use valuing processes, a teacher uses strategies of value clarification. A teacher responds to a child's value indicator with a clarifying response; a question like one of the many questions listed by Raths and others (1966). Clarifying responses are questions that are directed by the teacher to an individual pupil to elicit thinking about the pupil's values. The test of the worth of a clarifying response is whether it results in a pupil thinking on what he has said or done, getting to know himself better, examining his choices, considering what he prizes and why, etc.

This kind of use of questions creates the clarifying evironment. A value-clarifying environment can be created by the teacher's use of value-clarifying questions (Raths and others, 1966). Herald (1969) suggested that teachers could use both the value-clarifying questions of Raths and the cognition-clarifying questions of Sanders (1966). This idea was tried out with a group of six elementary teachers, using Raths' approach. Herald reported that value-clarifying responses are a good way to achieve basic changes in teacher behavior and a good first step in altering classroom interaction. These indirect influences upon pupil's behavior have the effects of opening their thinking, helping children to acknowledge their own thinking, evaluate their choices in life, learn the consequences in their use of words, examine their attitudes, etc., without direct insistence by the teacher.

A teacher can influence pupil's learnings favorably in the realm of values through indirect means consisting of value-clarifying responses.

This rationale is only an extension into the realm of values of a similar rationale that is being implemented in the cognitive realm by the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (FWL). FWL uses the Flanders' Interaction Analysis with a rationale that teachers will be more effective and pupils will learn more if teachers will exert less direct influence upon cognitive learning and more indirect influence. Minicourses are being developed for use in pre and in-service training of teachers to help teachers to use the rationale, the Flanders' Interaction Analysis and the use of the cognition-clarifying questions of Sanders (1966).

Interaction Analysis of Value-Clarification Behaviors

The Flanders' Interaction Analysis Behaviors can be used as a model to construct a similar instrument for use with value-clarifying responses by teachers. The instrument entitled, "Interaction Analysis of Value-Clarification Behaviors" (IAVCB), is constructed on this model. Accordingly, there are the same basic categories of Teacher Talk, Student Talk and Silence or Confusion. As with the Flanders' instrument, all categories are mutually exclusive, yet they include all value talk in the classroom.

The Categories

The teacher's Direct Talk comprises those occasions in which a teacher tells a pupil what he should believe, what he should do, what one ought to do, what is better than something else, etc., or the teacher attempts to influence directly some student in matters of value. Direct Talk includes moral and ethical imperatives (you shall, you must, you ought) value judgments (I believe you should,---is good), normative statements (the best rule is, professional practice is, most people feel, you must conform to), value indicators by the teacher, descriptive statements (---is better than) regarding some value. Rhetorical questions by the teacher are included when no real response is expected by the teacher and no real opportunity is given for response by the pupil. All these responses are labelled Lecturing as the first subcategory of Direct Talk by the teacher.

The second category is Rebuking or Punishing a pupil verbally following a verbal comment by a student expressing his own value. Instead of accepting or praising a student for his expression, the teacher rejects the student or rejects the concept of the competence of the student to make his statement on values. Ridicule is included in this category.

The third subcategory of Direct Talk by the teacher is Dissonant Response. Dissonant Responses are verbal attempts by the teacher to influence directly what a student or a group thinks about a value or about the pupil who has expressed a position on a value. Klevan (1968) has done an excellent job of analyzing and discussing these Dissonant Responses and his discussion should be studied with care. In brief terms, Dissonant Responses are questions that are used to distort a pupil's utterance, discredit it, counter it, focus on extreme and indeterminate matters, criticize or judge (condemn it outright or damn it with faint praise). The 18 dissonant questions of Klevan are included in this subcategory.

The teacher's Indirect Talk on values comprises the three kinds of clarifying responses of Raths (1966) and of Klevan (1968), and a fourth subcategory of a teacher initiated question. The difference between the first three subcategories is that these are responses by the teacher to the pupil's expression of a Value Indicator, while the fourth subcategory is a question that is initiated by the teacher, e.g., in the course of a lesson to emphasize an implication of the lesson with reference to a value.

The three subcategories of value-clarifying responses are: (1) Choosing, (2) Prizing and (3) Acting. In each subcategory, the teacher responds with a question that is intended to lead the pupil into the value response that is named. Raths lists more than 100 questions, each classified into one of the three valuing processes. The observer should study these lists of questions.

The Choosing and Prizing categories need no more discussion in addition to that of Raths' and Klevan's, but the Acting category needs additional clarification. If the observer will attempt to classify the questions that are listed by Raths for this Acting category, he is likely to find that most or all can be clearly perceived in terms of the cognitive categories of Bloom's Taxonomy. In other words, Raths is saying that teachers act in the domain of values by means of questions and the purpose of these questions is to lead the pupil to gain more information (Knowledge), gain understanding (Comprehension), Apply their understandings, Analyze, Synthesize new understandings and Evaluate learnings in matters of values. Acting responses by teachers are questions leading pupils to the cognitive activities of the Taxonomy in matters of value.

There are three categories of Student Talk; Response by the student, a Value Indicator and a question initiated by the student (Inquiry).

The Student Talk-Response subcategory is a response by the student to a value-clarifying question by the teacher.

The Student-Talk Value Indicator is an expression by the student of his own goals, purposes, aspirations, interest, activities, worries, problems, obstacles, attitudes, beliefs and feelings. Each Value Indicator is an indicator to the teacher that a clarifying response is called for.

The third category of Student Talk is the initiation by the student of Acting processes. These include clarifying questions on values that are conceived and uttered by the student as part of his personal inquiry and growth and development. These use the cognitive Taxonomy as a guide. They include questions that are formulated to gather information (Knowledge), try to understand (Comprehension), Apply, Analyze, Synthesize and Evaluate.

The last category of the IAVCB is that of silence or confusion. This is a three-second time period in which there is no communication on values (if there was a communication within the preceding three-second interval).

As with the Flanders' instrument, ground rules are needed to deal with problems of categorization. Pending the results of a pilot study, the five ground rules that are used with the Flanders' instrument are tentatively accepted for use with the IAVCB:

1. "When not certain in which of two or more categories a statement belongs, choose the category that is numerically furthest from Category 5" (middle category).

2. "If the primary tone of the teacher's behavior has been consistently direct or consistently indirect, do not shift into the opposite classification unless a clear indication of shift is given by the teacher."

3. "The observer must not be overly concerned with his own biases or with the teacher's intent."

4. "If more than one category occurs during the three-second interval, then all categories used in that interval are recorded; therefore, record each change in category. If no change occurs within three seconds, repeat that category number."

5. "If a silence is long enough for a break in the interaction to be discernable, and if it occurs at a three-second recording time, it is recorded as a 10." As with the Flanders' instrument categorization should be done in terms of the effects upon the freedom of students to respond in matters of values (Amidon and Flanders, 1963).

Usage and Interpretation of Results

Data are recorded with the IAVCB in the same manner as with the Flanders' instrument (Amidon and Flanders, 1963). An interaction matrix is then formed using 11 columns, rather than 10, and analyzed in terms of percentages of Teacher Talk, and of Student Talk. The Indirect to Direct Ratios are computed as follows, modelled after the Flanders:

ID ratio = sum columns 1-4 divided by sum columns 5-7
Revised ID ratio = sum columns 1-3 divided by sum columns 6-7
Adequacy ratio = sum columns 1-3 divided by column 9

(Amidon and Flanders, 1963)

REFERENCES

Amidon, E. J. and Flanders, N. A. The Role of the Teacher In the Classroom: A Manual For Understanding and Improving Teachers' Classroom Behavior. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Paul S. Amidon Associates, 1963.

Boleratz, J. M. "Learning By Discovery: An Experimental Study To Measure Its Effectiveness For Teacher Value Concepts." Journal of Experimental Education. Winter, 1967, 36(2), 13-21.

Borg, W. R. The Minicourse: Rationale and Uses In the Inservice Education of Teachers. ED 024 647, 1968.

Campbell, J. R. and Barnes, C. W. "Interaction Analysis - A Breakthrough?" Phi Delta Kappan. 1969, 50(10), 587-590.

Herald, M. C. "My 'Talk' Will Be Different - Improving Classroom Communication." National Elementary Principal. 1969, 58(4), 12-16.

Klevan, A. "Clarifying As a Teaching Process." Educational Leadership. 25: 454-455. February 1968.

Lippincott, W. T. "Learning and the Value Sphere." Journal of Chemical Education. 1969, 46, 333.

Paschal, B. J. "Values As Basic In Education." School & Society. 96: 77-78; February 3, 1968.

Pilder, W. F. "Values As a Process of Encounter." Educational Leadership. 1970, 27(5), 449-451.

Raths and Others. Values and Teaching: Working With Values In the Classroom. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, 1966.

Sanders, N. M. Classroom Questions: What Kinds?" New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

Categories For Interaction Analysis of Value Clarification Behaviors

TEACHER TALK	INDIRECT INFLUENCE	1. Choosing: Teacher asks questions leading student to select, elect or choose a value a. Freely b. From Alternatives C. After Consideration 2. Prizing: Teacher asks questions leading student to express his liking for a value a. Cherishing b. Affirming 3. Acting: Teacher asks questions leading student to do something, to act repeatedly, to clarify his value a. Do Something - inquire, seek more information, comprehend, apply, analyze, synthesize and evaluate a value b. Do Repeatedly - ask questions repeatedly 4. Asks Question: Teacher initiates a question on a value
	DIRECT INFLUENCE	5. Lecturing: Teacher gives his own opinion on values in various forms. Imperatives - you must -. Judgments - -- is good. Normative statements - The rule is --. Descriptive Statement - This is better than --. Ask rhetorical questions. Included are statements, e.g. You ought to --. I believe you should do --. Most people do --. Most people feel that --. Informed perspective --. My feeling about that is --. 6. Rebuking and/or Punishing: Teacher rejects pupil's questions and/or value, devaluates the worth and competence of the question of the pupil. A threatening manner and punishment may be added. 7. Dissonant Responses: Teacher uses the dissonant responses of Klevan to distort pupil's utterance, discredit it, counter it, focus on extreme and indeterminate matters, critize, judge.
STUDENT TALK		8. Student Talk - Response: Student responds to teacher's value - clarifying question indicating Choosing, Prizing or Acting on a value. 9. Student Talk - Value Indicator: Student expresses his own attitude, interest, purpose, aspiration, past or intended activity. 10. Student Talk - Inquiry: Student initiates a question to the teacher about a value or asks a question in response to the teacher's question, seeking more knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, evaluation about a value. 11. Silence or Confusion: Silence for short periods, pause in which no verbal communications occurs on a value or its indicator.